

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 2, 11 and 20 are requested to be cancelled.

Claims 1, 10, 20 and 22 are currently being amended. These claims have been amended to incorporate the limitation of claims 2, 11, and 21, respectively.

Claims 23-33 are being added to cover the aspect of the order being random, but predetermined, the order being selected, and the links being to different servers.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1, 3-10, 12-20, and 22-33 are now pending in this application.

Claim 21 has been cancelled, thereby obviating the section 112 rejection thereof.

The claims were rejected under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Bates (US 6,751,777). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration thereof is requested.

The Office Action cites Fig. 11 of Bates as anticipating the invention defined in claim 2, now incorporated into claim 1. Fig. 11 and the accompanying text at column 14, describes a chronological set of links, wherein each link has associated therewith a "chronological criteria that must be met prior to selecting the target." See column 11, lines 22-23.

Accordingly, each link in the grouping is selected (but not actuated, i.e., an HTTP request is not dispatched in order to access the service), and then a chronological criteria associated with that link is assessed to determine whether it is met. If the criteria is not met, then the next link is selected and its chronological criteria is assessed. Only when the chronological criteria is met for a link, is an HTTP request dispatched.

In contrast, in the amended claim, each link is actuated—an HTTP request is dispatched “in a predetermined order established prior to dispatch.” Each independent claim has been amended to include this limitation.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date October 13, 2006

By 

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Customer Number: 22879
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,874